arXiv:1408.3306v2 [math.CV] 5 Nov 2014

Rigidity of Proper Holomorphic Self-mappings of the Pentablock

Guicong Su, Zhenhan Tu* and Lei Wang

School of Mathematics and Statistics, Wuhan University,
Wuhan, Hubei 430072, P.R. China
Email: suguicong@whu.edu.cn (G. Su), zhhtu.math@whu.edu.cn (Z. Tu)
and wanglei2012@whu.edu.cn (L. Wang)

Abstract. The pentablock is a Hartogs domain in $\mathbb{C}^3$ over the symmetrized bidisc in $\mathbb{C}^2$. The domain is a bounded inhomogeneous pseudoconvex domain, and does not have a $\mathcal{C}^1$ boundary. Recently, Agler-Lykova-Young constructed a special subgroup of the group of holomorphic automorphisms of the pentablock, and Kosiński completely described the group of holomorphic automorphisms of the pentablock. The purpose of this paper is to prove that any proper holomorphic self-mapping of the pentablock must be an automorphism.

Key words: Automorphisms, Hartogs domains, proper holomorphic self-mappings, symmetrized bidisc, the pentablock.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 32A07, 32H35.

1 Introduction

Let $\mathbb{C}^{2\times 2}$ denote the space of 2×2 complex matrices, with the usual operator norm, i.e., for a matric $A\in\mathbb{C}^{2\times 2}$,

$$||A|| := \sup\left\{||zA||/||z|| :\ z\in\mathbb{C}^2, z\neq 0\right\},$$

in which $\mathbb{C}^2$ is equipped with the standard Hermitian norm. Recently Agler-Lykova-Young [2] introduced the bounded domain $\mathcal{P}$ by

$$\mathcal{P} := \left\{(a_{21}, \operatorname{tr} A, \det A) : A=[a_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^2\in\mathbb{B}\right\},$$

where

$$\mathbb{B} := \left\{A\in\mathbb{C}^{2\times 2} :\ ||A||<1\right\}$$

denotes the open unit ball in the space $\mathbb{C}^{2\times 2}$ with the usual operator norm. So $\mathcal{P}$ is an image of $\mathbb{B}$ under the holomorphic mapping $A=[a_{ij}]\mapsto(a_{21},\operatorname{tr}A,\det A)$. The domain $\mathcal{P}$ is called the *pentablock* in Agler-Lykova-Young [2], as $\mathcal{P}\cap\mathbb{R}^3$ is a convex body bounded by five faces, in which three of them are flat and two are curved.

The pentablock $\mathcal{P}$ is polynomially convex and starlike about the origin, but neither circled nor convex, and does not have a $\mathcal{C}^1$ boundary (see Agler-Lykova-Young [2]). The pentablock is a bounded inhomogeneous domain (see Th. 15 in Kosiński [14]). For the complex geometry and function theory of the pentablock $\mathcal{P}$, see Agler-Lykova-Young [2] and Kosiński [14] for details.

The pentablock $\mathcal{P}$ arises in connection with the *structured singular value*, a cost function on matrices introduced by control engineers in the context of robust stabilization with respect to modelling uncertainty (e.g., see Doyle [8]). The structured

*Corresponding author.

singular value is denoted by μ, and engineers have proposed an interpolation problem called the *μ-synthesis problem* that arises from this source. Attempts to solve cases of this interpolation problem have also led to the study of two other domains, the *symmetrised disc* (e.g., see [3, 11]) and the *tetrablock* (e.g., see [10, 20]), in $\mathbb{C}^2$ and $\mathbb{C}^3$ respectively, which have turned out to have many properties of interest to specialists in several complex variables (e.g., see [1, 11, 13]) and to operator theorists (e.g., see [5, 16]).

Here and throughout the paper, $\mathbb{D}$ denotes the open unit disc in the complex plane, additionally by $\mathbb{T}$ we shall denote the unit circle.

The pentablock is closely related to the symmetrized bidisc $\mathbb{G}_2$, which is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{C}^2$ as follows:

$$\mathbb{G}_2 := \left\{(\lambda_1+\lambda_2, \lambda_1\lambda_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : \ \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{D}\right\}.$$

For $(s,p) \in \mathbb{C}^2$, it is easy to check (see Th. 2.1 in [2]) that $(s,p) \in \mathbb{G}_2$ if and only if $|s - \bar{s}p| + |p|^2 < 1$. So the symmetrized bidisc $\mathbb{G}_2$ can be also described as

$$\mathbb{G}_2 = \left\{(s,p) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : \ |s-\bar{s}p| + |p|^2 < 1\right\}.$$

The symmetrized bidisc is important since it is the first known example of a bounded pseudoconvex domain for which the Carathéodory and Lempert functions coincide, but which cannot be exhausted by domains biholomorphic to convex ones (see Costara [6] and Edigarian [9]).

Edigarian-Zwonek [11] gave the characterization of proper holomorphic self-mappings of the symmetrized polydisc, which, in the special case of the symmetrized bidisc, reduces the result as follows.

Theorem 1 *(Edigarian-Zwonek [11]) Let $f : \mathbb{G}_2 \to \mathbb{G}_2$ be a holomorphic mapping. Then f is proper if and only if there exists a finite Blaschke product B such that*

$$f(\lambda_1+\lambda_2, \lambda_1\lambda_2) = (B(\lambda_1)+B(\lambda_2), B(\lambda_1)B(\lambda_2)) \ \ (\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{D}).$$

In particular, f is an automorphism if and only if

$$f(\lambda_1+\lambda_2, \lambda_1\lambda_2) = (\nu(\lambda_1)+\nu(\lambda_2), \nu(\lambda_1)\nu(\lambda_2)) \ \ (\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{D}),$$

where ν is an automorphism of the unit disc $\mathbb{D}$. As $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{G}_2)$ does not act transitively on $\mathbb{G}_2$, the symmetrized bidisc is inhomogeneous.

By definition of the domain $\mathcal{P}$, the pentablock is a Hartogs domain in $\mathbb{C}^3$ over the symmetrized bidisc $\mathbb{G}_2$. Indeed, it is clear from the definition that $\mathcal{P}$ is fibred over $\mathbb{G}_2$ by the map

$$(a,s,p) \mapsto (s,p),$$

since if $A \in \mathbb{B}(\subset \mathbb{C}^{2\times 2})$, then the eigenvalues of A lie in $\mathbb{D}$ and so $(\mathrm{tr}\, A, \det A) \in \mathbb{G}_2$. More precisely (e.g., see Th. 1.1 in Agler-Lykova-Young [2]), one has

$$\mathcal{P} = \left\{(a,s,p) \in \mathbb{D}\times\mathbb{G}_2 : |a|^2 < e^{-u(s,p)}\right\}, \tag{1}$$

where

$$u(s,p)=-2\log\left|1-\frac{\frac{1}{2}s\bar{\beta}}{1+\sqrt{1-|\beta|^2}}\right|,$$

in which $\beta=\frac{s-\bar{s}p}{1-|p|^2}$. Note the exp in display (1) is natural because it was important in Kosiński [14] due to Kiselman's results on $\mathbb{C}$-convex Hartogs domains.

Note we have $u(s,0)=-2\left(\log\left(1+(1-s\bar{s})^{1/2}\right)-\log 2\right)$ and so

$$\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial s\partial\bar{s}}(0,0)=1/2. \tag{2}$$

Theorem 1.1 in Agler-Lykova-Young [2] also proved

$$e^{-u(\lambda_1+\lambda_2,\lambda_1\lambda_2)/2}=\frac{1}{2}|1-\lambda_1\overline{\lambda_2}|+\frac{1}{2}(1-|\lambda_1|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}(1-|\lambda_2|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}\ \ (\lambda_1,\lambda_2\in\mathbb{D})$$

and thus gives another description of the pentablock as follows:

$$\mathcal{P}=\left\{(a,\lambda_1+\lambda_2,\lambda_1\lambda_2):\ |a|<\frac{1}{2}|1-\lambda_1\overline{\lambda_2}|+\frac{1}{2}(1-|\lambda_1|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}(1-|\lambda_2|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}},\lambda_1,\lambda_2\in\mathbb{D}\right\}. \tag{3}$$

In 2014, Agler-Lykova-Young [2] constructed a special subgroup of the group of holomorphic automorphisms of the pentablock as follows.

Theorem 2 *(Th. 1.2 in [2]) All mappings of the form*

$$f_{\omega,\nu}(a,\lambda_1+\lambda_2,\lambda_1\lambda_2)=\left(\frac{\omega(1-|\alpha|^2)a}{1-\bar{\alpha}(\lambda_1+\lambda_2)+\bar{\alpha}^2\lambda_1\lambda_2},\nu(\lambda_1)+\nu(\lambda_2),\nu(\lambda_1)\nu(\lambda_2)\right), \tag{4}$$

where $(a,\lambda_1+\lambda_2,\lambda_1\lambda_2)\in\mathcal{P}$, $\lambda_1,\lambda_2\in\mathbb{D}$, *form a subgroup of the group* $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{P})$ *of holomorphic automorphisms of the pentablock, where* ν *is a Möbius function of the form* $\nu(\lambda)=\eta\frac{\lambda-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}\lambda}$, *in which* $\omega,\eta\in\mathbb{T}$, $\alpha\in\mathbb{D}$.

Furthermore, Kosiński [14] completely described the group of holomorphic automorphisms of the pentablock as follows.

Theorem 3 *(Th. 15 in [14]) All automorphisms of the form* (4) *comprise the whole group* $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{P})$ *of holomorphic automorphisms of the pentablock.*

In this paper we study proper holomorphic self-mappings of the pentablock and prove that any proper holomorphic self-mapping of the pentablock must be a mapping of the form (4) as follows:

Theorem 4 *Any proper holomorphic self-mapping of the pentablock must be an automorphism of the form* (4).

This paper will use Theorem 2 to give a unified proof for Theorem 3 and Theorem 4. Generally speaking, a proper holomorphic mapping between two bounded domains may lead naturally to the geometric study of a mapping between their boundaries. These researches are often heavily based on analytic techniques about the mapping on boundaries (e.g., see Huang [12] for references). As we know, the pentablock is a bounded inhomogeneous pseudoconvex domain, and does not have a

$\mathcal{C}^1$ boundary. The lack of boundary regularity usually presents a serious analytical difficulty (e.g., see Mok-Ng-Tu [15], Tu [17, 18] and Tu-Wang [19]). The crucial tools used in deducing Theorem 4 involves holomorphic extendability of proper holomorphic mapping between quasi-balanced domains whose Minkowsi functions are continuous (see Kosiński [13]), the description of proper holomorphic self-mappings of the symmetrized bidisc (see Edigarian-Zwonek [11]), the complex geometry of the boundary of the pentablock (see Agler-Lykova-Young [2] and Kosiński [14]), and the rigidity of proper holomorphic self-mappings and the description of automorphisms of the ellipsoids (see Dini-Primicerio [7]).

2 Preliminaries

As the pentablock $\mathcal{P}$ is a Hartogs domain in $\mathbb{C}^3$ over a symmetrized bidisc $\mathbb{G}_2$, it is important to learn the basic complex geometry of the symmetrized bidisc $\mathbb{G}_2$.

Lemma 1 *(Prop. 3.2 in Agler-Lykova-Young [1]) Let the symmetrized bidisc $\mathbb{G}_2$ be defined as*

$$\mathbb{G}_2 := \left\{(\lambda_1+\lambda_2, \lambda_1\lambda_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : \ \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{D}\right\}.$$

Then we have the following results.

(i) For $(s,p) \in \mathbb{C}^2$, then $(s,p) \in \mathbb{G}_2$ if and only if $|s-\bar{s}p|+|p|^2 < 1$;

(ii) For $(s,p) \in \mathbb{C}^2$, then $(s,p) \in \partial\mathbb{G}_2$ if and only if $|s| \leq 2$ and $|s-\bar{s}p|+|p|^2 = 1$.

(iii) By $\partial_s\mathbb{G}_2$ denote its Shilov boundary. Then

$$\partial_s\mathbb{G}_2 = \left\{(\lambda_1+\lambda_2, \lambda_1\lambda_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : \ \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{T}\right\}.$$

The royal variety Σ of the symmetrized bidisc $\mathbb{G}_2$ plays an important role in the study of the symmetrized bidisc. Recall the royal variety

$$\Sigma := \left\{(2\lambda, \lambda^2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : \ \lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}\right\} \ (\subset \overline{\mathbb{G}}_2).$$

Let the mapping $\sigma : \mathbb{D}^2 \to \mathbb{G}_2$ be defined by

$$\sigma(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) := (\lambda_1+\lambda_2, \lambda_1\lambda_2).$$

Thus the mapping $\sigma : \mathbb{D}^2 \to \mathbb{G}_2$ is a proper holomorphic mapping. Note σ is well-defined on $\mathbb{C}^2$, and

$$\sigma : \ \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{(\lambda,\lambda) : \ \lambda \in \mathbb{C}\} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \left\{(2\lambda, \lambda^2) : \ \lambda \in \mathbb{C}\right\}$$

is a holomorphic covering. Thus we have $\sigma(\partial\mathbb{D}^2) = \partial\mathbb{G}_2$, and the boundary part $\partial\mathbb{G}_2 \setminus \partial_s\mathbb{G}_2$ of the symmetrized bidisc is a Levi flat part of the boundary.

Now return to the pentablock, by Agler-Lykova-Young [2], we have that $\mathcal{P}$ is a domain of holomorphy and $\mathcal{P}$ does not have a $\mathcal{C}^1$ boundary. Consequently much of the theory of pseudoconvex domains does not apply to $\mathcal{P}$. But follwing Kosiński [14], we obtain some useful boundary properties.

Lemma 2 *(Lemmas 11 and 13 in Kosiński [14]) (i) Any point x of*

$$\partial_1\mathcal{P} := \left\{(a,s,p) \in \mathbb{C}\times\mathbb{G}_2 : \ |a|^2 = e^{-u(s,p)}\right\} \ (= \partial\mathcal{P} \cap (\mathbb{C}\times\mathbb{G}_2))$$

is a smooth point of the boundary $\partial\mathcal{P}$. Moreover the rank of the Levi form of a defining function of $\partial\mathcal{P}$ at the point x restricted to the complex tangent space is equal to 1; As u is not a pluriharmonic function, $\partial_1\mathcal{P}$ is not Levi flat.

(*ii*) *The boundary part*

$$\partial_2\mathcal{P} := \left\{(a,s,p) \in \mathbb{D}\times\partial\mathbb{G}_2 :\ (s,p) \in \partial\mathbb{G}_2 \setminus \partial_s\mathbb{G}_2,\ |a|^2 < e^{-u(s,p)}\right\}$$

is a Levi flat part of the boundary $\partial\mathcal{P}$ and $\partial_2\mathcal{P} \subset \partial\mathcal{P} \cap (\mathbb{C}\times(\partial\mathbb{G}_2 \setminus \partial_s\mathbb{G}_2))$.

Note that we have $e^{-u(s,p)} > 0$ on $\partial\mathbb{G}_2 \setminus \Sigma$ by combining (1) and (3). Therefore, $e^{-u(s,p)} > 0$ on $\partial\mathbb{G}_2 \setminus \partial_s\mathbb{G}_2$. So $\partial_2\mathcal{P}$ is obviously a Levi flat part of the boundary $\partial\mathcal{P}$, as $\partial\mathbb{G}_2 \setminus \partial_s\mathbb{G}_2$ is a Levi flat part of the boundary $\partial\mathbb{G}_2$.

We will use the notion of quasi-circular domains. Let $m_1,\cdots,m_n$ be relatively prime natural numbers. Recall that a domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is said to be $(m_1,\cdots,m_n)$-circular (shortly quasi-circular) if

$$(\lambda^{m_1}z_1,\cdots,\lambda^{m_n}z_n) \in D$$

for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$ and $z = (z_1,\cdots,z_n) \in D$. If the relation holds for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$, then D is said to be $(m_1,\cdots,m_n)$-balanced (shortly quasi-balanced). After a minor modification of the argument in Bell [4], Kosiński [13] get the holomorphic extendability of the proper holomorphic mappings as follows.

Lemma 3 *(Lemma 6 in Kosiński [13]) Let D, G be bounded domains in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Suppose that G is $(m_1,\cdots,m_n)$-circular and contains the origin. Assume moreover that the Bergman kernel function $K_D(z,\overline{\xi})$ $(z,\xi \in D)$ associated to D satisfies the following property: for any open, relatively compact subset E of D there is an open set $U = U(E)$ containing $\overline{D}$ such that $K_D(z,\overline{\xi})$ extends to be holomorphic on U as a function of z for each $\xi \in E$. Then any proper holomorphic mapping $f : D \to G$ extends holomorphically to a neighborhood of $\overline{D}$.*

Now we consider the proper holomorphic self-mappings of the pentablock $\mathcal{P}$. It follows from Agler-Lykova-Young [2] that the pentablock $\mathcal{P}$ is $(1,1,2)$-balanced and $\mathcal{P}_r = \{(ra,rs,r^2p) :\ (a,s,p) \in \mathcal{P}\}$ are relatively compact in $\mathcal{P}$ for any $0 < r < 1$. Thus by Remark 7 in Kosiński [13], (quasi) Minkowski functional of the pentablock $\mathcal{P}$ is continuous, and thus the pentablock $\mathcal{P}$ fulfils the assumptions of D in Lemma 3. Therefore, Lemma 3 implies the holomorphic extendability of the proper holomorphic self-mappings of $\mathcal{P}$ as follows.

Lemma 4 *Any proper holomorphic self-mapping of the pentablock $\mathcal{P}$ extends holomorphically to a neighborhood of $\overline{\mathcal{P}}$.*

Since $\mathcal{P}$ is a Hartogs domain over a symmetrized bidisc, we define

$$\Omega := \left\{(a,2\lambda,\lambda^2) \in \mathcal{P} :\ \lambda \in \mathbb{D}\right\},$$

i.e., $\Omega = \left\{(a,2\lambda,\lambda^2) :\ |a| < 1-|\lambda|^2,\ \lambda \in \mathbb{D}\right\}$, and set $\widetilde{\Omega} := \{(a,s) :\ (a,s,p) \in \Omega\}$. Then we have

$$\widetilde{\Omega} = \left\{(a,s) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : |a| + \frac{|s|^2}{4} < 1\right\}$$

is an ellipsoid. By the rigidity of proper holomorphic self-mappings and the description of automorphisms of the ellipsoids (see Corollary 1.2 in Dini-Primicerio [7]), we get the following lemma as follows.

Lemma 5 *(Dini-Primicerio [7]) Let $\varphi : \widetilde{\Omega} \to \widetilde{\Omega}$ be a proper holomorphic mapping. Then φ is an automorphism of $\widetilde{\Omega}$. Moreover, if $\varphi(0,0) = (\xi, 0)$ for some $|\xi| < 1$, then there exists $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{T}$ such that $\varphi(a,s) \equiv (\lambda_1 a, \lambda_2 s)$ on $\widetilde{\Omega}$.*

3 Proof of Theorem 4

Let $f = (f_1, f_2, f_3) : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{P}$ be a proper holomorphic mapping. By Lemma 4, f extends holomorphically to a neighborhood V of $\overline{\mathcal{P}}$ with $f(\partial\mathcal{P}) \subset \partial\mathcal{P}$. Define

$$S := \{\xi \in V : J_f(\xi) = 0\},$$

where $J_f(\xi) = \det(\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial \xi_j})$ is the complex Jacobian determinant of $f(\xi)$ $(\xi \in V)$.

Step 1. Consider the mapping $\Psi : \mathbb{G}_2 \to \mathbb{G}_2$ defined by

$$\Psi : (s,p) \mapsto (f_2(0,s,p), f_3(0,s,p)). \tag{5}$$

Then Ψ extends holomorphically to the closure $\overline{\mathbb{G}}_2$. We will prove that $\Psi : \mathbb{G}_2 \to \mathbb{G}_2$ is a proper holomorphic self-mapping of $\mathbb{G}_2$ here.

Since $\partial_2\mathcal{P}$ is a Levi flat part of the boundary of the pentablock by Lemma 2, by the local biholomorphism of f on $\partial_2\mathcal{P} \setminus S$, we have that, for any $(a,s,p) \in \partial_2\mathcal{P} \setminus S$, $f(a,s,p)$ lies in a Levi flat part of the boundary of the pentablock and thus $f(a,s,p) \in \partial\mathcal{P} \setminus \partial_1\mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{C} \times \partial\mathbb{G}_2$.

By Lemma 1, we have

$$\partial\mathbb{G}_2 = \{(s,p) : |s| \leq 2 \text{ and } |s - \bar{s}p| + |p|^2 = 1\}.$$

Thus, for $(a,s,p) \in \partial_2\mathcal{P} \setminus S$, we have

$$|f_2(a,s,p) - \overline{f_2(a,s,p)} f_3(a,s,p)| + |f_3(a,s,p)|^2 = 1.$$

Because of the density of $\partial_2\mathcal{P} \setminus S$ in $\partial_2\mathcal{P}$ and the continuity of f on $\overline{\mathcal{P}}$, we conclude

$$|f_2(a,s,p) - \overline{f_2(a,s,p)} f_3(a,s,p)| + |f_3(a,s,p)|^2 = 1 \tag{6}$$

for all $(a,s,p) \in \partial_2\mathcal{P}$.

Note that $(0,s,p) \in \partial_2\mathcal{P}$ for all $(s,p) \in \partial\mathbb{G}_2 \setminus \partial_s\mathbb{G}_2$, as $e^{-u(s,p)} > 0$ on $\partial\mathbb{G}_2 \setminus \partial_s\mathbb{G}_2$. This means

$$|f_2(0,s,p) - \overline{f_2(0,s,p)} f_3(0,s,p)| + |f_3(0,s,p)|^2 = 1$$

for all $(s,p) \in \partial\mathbb{G}_2 \setminus \partial_s\mathbb{G}_2$, and then holds for all $(s,p) \in \partial\mathbb{G}_2$ by the continuity of f on $\overline{\mathcal{P}}$. Obviously $|f_2(0,s,p)| \leq 2$ for all $(s,p) \in \partial\mathbb{G}_2$. So Ψ maps $\partial\mathbb{G}_2$ into $\partial\mathbb{G}_2$. Thus we get that

$$\Psi : \ (s,p) \mapsto (f_2(0,s,p), f_3(0,s,p))$$

is a proper holomorphic self-mapping of $\mathbb{G}_2$. So, Theorem 1 implies which there is a finite Blaschke product b such that

$$(f_2(0, \lambda_1 + \lambda_2, \lambda_1\lambda_2), f_3(0, \lambda_1 + \lambda_2, \lambda_1\lambda_2) = (b(\lambda_1) + b(\lambda_2), b(\lambda_1)b(\lambda_2)) \tag{7}$$

for all $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{D}$.

Step 2. Here we will prove that the proper holomorphic mapping $f = (f_1, f_2, f_3) : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{P}$ must map a fiber to a fiber over $\mathbb{G}_2$.

Fix $(s,p) \in \partial_s\mathbb{G}_2$ with $s^2 \neq 4p$ (i.e., $(s,p) \in \partial_s\mathbb{G}_2 \setminus \Sigma$). As $e^{-u(s,p)} > 0$ on $\partial_s\mathbb{G}_2 \setminus \Sigma$ (this can be seen by combining (1) and (3)), we have $(a,s,p) \in \partial\mathcal{P}$ for $|a|^2 < e^{-u(s,p)}$. However, by combining (5) and (7), we have

$$|f_3(0,s,p)| = 1$$

for any $(s,p) \in \partial_s\mathbb{G}_2$, as $|b(\lambda_1)b(\lambda_2)| = 1$ for $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{T}$. This means that $f_3(a,s,p)$ ($|a|^2 < e^{-u(s,p)}$) attains its maximum modulus at the point $a = 0$. Thus $f_3(a,s,p)$ is independent of a for fixed $(s,p) \in \partial_s\mathbb{G}_2$ with $s^2 \neq 4p$.

Now still fix $(s,p) \in \partial_s\mathbb{G}_2$ with $s^2 \neq 4p$. Then we have $f_3(a,s,p) \equiv e^{i\theta}$ for some $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. Because of the density of $\partial_2\mathcal{P}$ in $\partial\mathcal{P} \cap (\mathbb{C} \times \partial\mathbb{G}_2)$ and the continuity of f on $\overline{\mathcal{P}}$, from (6) we conclude

$$|f_2(a,s,p) - \overline{f_2(a,s,p)}f_3(a,s,p)| + |f_3(a,s,p)|^2 = 1$$

for all $(a,s,p) \in \partial\mathcal{P} \cap (\mathbb{C} \times \partial\mathbb{G}_2)$. Then, we have $f_2(a,s,p) = \overline{f_2(a,s,p)}e^{i\theta}$ for all $|a|^2 < e^{-u(s,p)}$. Thus $f_2(a,s,p)$ is independent of a for fixed $(s,p) \in \partial_s\mathbb{G}_2$ with $s^2 \neq 4p$ as well.

Therefore, $f_2(a,s,p)$ and $f_3(a,s,p)$ are independent of a for $|a|^2 < e^{-u(s,p)}$ with fixed $(s,p) \in \partial_s\mathbb{G}_2$ ($s^2 \neq 4p$). This means that for all positive integers k,

$$\frac{\partial^k f_2}{\partial a^k}(0,s,p) = 0 \ \text{ and } \ \frac{\partial^k f_3}{\partial a^k}(0,s,p) = 0$$

for $(s,p) \in \partial_s\mathbb{G}_2$ ($s^2 \neq 4p$), and thus holds for all $(s,p) \in \partial_s\mathbb{G}_2$ by the holomorphism of f on $\overline{\mathcal{P}}$. Since $\partial_s\mathbb{G}_2$ is the Shilov boundary of $\mathbb{G}_2$, we have that for all positive integers k,

$$\frac{\partial^k f_2}{\partial a^k}(0,s,p) \equiv 0 \ \text{ and } \ \frac{\partial^k f_3}{\partial a^k}(0,s,p) \equiv 0 \ \ ((s,p) \in \mathbb{G}_2).$$

That is, $f_2(a,s,p)$ and $f_3(a,s,p)$ defined on $\mathcal{P}$ are independent of a. So, from (7), there exists a finite Blaschke product b such that

$$f(a, \lambda_1 + \lambda_2, \lambda_1\lambda_2) = (f_1(a, \lambda_1 + \lambda_2, \lambda_1\lambda_2), b(\lambda_1) + b(\lambda_2), b(\lambda_1)b(\lambda_2)) \tag{8}$$

for $(a, \lambda_1 + \lambda_2, \lambda_1\lambda_2) \in \mathcal{P}$, in which $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{D}$.

Step 3. Here we will prove that f is an automorphism of the form (4).

By (8), we have

$$f(a, 2\lambda, \lambda^2) = (f_1(a, 2\lambda, \lambda^2), 2b(\lambda), b(\lambda)^2)$$

for $(a, 2\lambda, \lambda^2) \in \mathcal{P}$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$. So f preserves

$$\Omega := \{(a, 2\lambda, \lambda^2) \in \mathcal{P} : \ \lambda \in \mathbb{D}\} = \{(a, 2\lambda, \lambda^2) \in \mathbb{C}^3 : \ |a| < 1 - |\lambda|^2, \ \lambda \in \mathbb{D}\},$$

i.e., $f(\Omega) \subset \Omega$. Note that the group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{G}_2)$ of the symmetrized bidisc $\mathbb{G}_2$ acts transitively on $\{(2\lambda, \lambda^2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : \ \lambda \in \mathbb{D}\} (\subset \mathbb{G}_2)$. Then, we can take some $\varphi_1 \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{P})$ in the form (4) such that

$$\varphi_1 \circ f(0,0,0) = \varphi_1(f_1(0,0,0), 2b(0), b(0)^2) = (r, 0, 0)$$

for some $0 \le r < 1$. Then

$$F(a,s,p) := \varphi_1 \circ f(a,s,p) : \ \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{P}$$

is a proper holomorphic self-mapping of $\mathcal{P}$ with $F(0,0,0) = (r,0,0)$ for some $0 \le r < 1$. So, from (8) there exists a finite Blaschke product $\tilde{b}$ with $\tilde{b}(0) = 0$ such that

$$F(a, \lambda_1+\lambda_2, \lambda_1\lambda_2) = (F_1(a, \lambda_1+\lambda_2, \lambda_1\lambda_2),\ \tilde{b}(\lambda_1)+\tilde{b}(\lambda_2),\ \tilde{b}(\lambda_1)\tilde{b}(\lambda_2)) \qquad (9)$$

for $(a, \lambda_1+\lambda_2, \lambda_1\lambda_2) \in \mathcal{P}$, in which $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{D}$.

Let

$$\widetilde{\Omega} := \{(a, 2\lambda) : \ (a, 2\lambda, \lambda^2) \in \mathcal{P}\} = \{(a,s) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : |a| + \frac{|s|^2}{4} < 1\},$$

an ellipsoid. Then the mapping $\Phi : \widetilde{\Omega} \to \widetilde{\Omega}$ defined by

$$\Phi : (a,s) \mapsto (F_1(a,s,s^2/4),\ 2\tilde{b}(s/2))$$

is a proper holomorphic self-mapping of $\widetilde{\Omega}$ with $\Phi(0,0) = (r,0)$. Thus by Lemma 5, there exists $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in \mathbb{T}$ such that

$$\Phi(a,s) = (\eta_1 a,\ \eta_2 s),$$

that is,

$$F_1(a,s,s^2/4) = \eta_1 a, \ \ \tilde{b}(s) = \eta_2 s.$$

So, from (9), we have

$$F(a,s,p) = (F_1(a,s,p),\ \eta_2 s,\ \eta_2^2 p),$$

where $F_1(a,s,s^2/4) = \eta_1 a$. Note that $\varphi_2(a,s,p) := (a/\eta_1,\ s/\eta_2,\ p/\eta_2^2)$ $(\in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{P}))$ is of the form (4) such that

$$G(a,s,p) := \varphi_2 \circ F(a,s,p) = (G_1(a,s,p),\ s,\ p)$$

is a proper holomorphic self-mapping of $\mathcal{P}$ as well with $G_1(a,s,s^2/4) = a$. Thus the complex Jacobian determinant

$$J_G(a,0,0) \equiv 1 \ \ (|a| \le e^{-u(0,0)} = 1).$$

Since $G(a,s,p)$ is holomorphic on $\overline{\mathcal{P}}$, there exists a neighborhood U_0 of $(0,0)$ in the symmetrized bidisc $\mathbb{G}_2$ such that

$$J_G(a,s,p) \ne 0 \text{ everywhere on } \overline{\mathcal{P}} \cap (\mathbb{C} \times U_0).$$

Moreover, as $\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial s \partial \bar{s}}(0,0) = 1/2$ by (2), we may assume

$$\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial s \partial \bar{s}}(s,p) \ne 0 \qquad (10)$$

everywhere on U_0 also.

Thus we get that $G(a,s,p)=(G_1(a,s,p),\ s,\ p)$ restricted on $\mathcal{P}\cap(\mathbb{C}\times U_0)$ is a biholomorphic self-mapping of $\mathcal{P}\cap(\mathbb{C}\times U_0)$. So, for fixed $(s,p)\in U_0$, $G_1(a,s,p)$ on the disc $|a|^2<e^{-u(s,p)}$ is a *Möbius* function, i.e.,

$$G_1(a,s,p)=e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta(s,p)}\frac{a-G_1^{-1}(0,s,p)}{1-\overline{G_1^{-1}(0,s,p)}e^{u(s,p)}a},\quad (a,s,p)\in\mathcal{P}\cap(\mathbb{C}\times U_0).\tag{11}$$

Then

$$H(a,s,p):=e^{-\sqrt{-1}\theta(s,p)}\left(1-\overline{G_1^{-1}(0,s,p)}e^{u(s,p)}a\right)$$

is holomorphic in $\mathcal{P}\cap(\mathbb{C}\times U_0)$, and so

$$e^{-\sqrt{-1}\theta(s,p)}\ (=H(0,s,p))\ \text{ and }\ e^{-\sqrt{-1}\theta(s,p)}\overline{G_1^{-1}(0,s,p)}e^{u(s,p)}\ (=-\frac{\partial H(a,s,p)}{\partial a})$$

are holomorphic on U_0. Thus, from $|e^{-\sqrt{-1}\theta(s,p)}|\equiv 1$ on U_0 we get

$$e^{-\sqrt{-1}\theta(s,p)}\equiv e^{-\sqrt{-1}\theta_0}$$

on U_0. So

$$\overline{G_1^{-1}(0,s,p)}e^{u(s,p)}$$

is holomorphic on U_0 also. Assume that $G_1^{-1}(0,s,p)\neq 0$ everywhere on a small open ball V_0 of U_0. Then, from the holomorphism of $\overline{G_1^{-1}(0,s,p)}e^{u(s,p)}$ on V_0, we immediately get $u(s,p)$ is pluriharmonic on V_0, a contradiction with (10). Thus we get $G_1^{-1}(0,s,p)\equiv 0$ on U_0. Therefore, we get $G_1(a,s,p)=e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta_0}a$ on $\mathcal{P}\cap(\mathbb{C}\times U_0)$ by (11) and so

$$G(a,s,p)=(e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta_0}a,\ s,\ p)$$

on $\mathcal{P}$ by the identity principle, which means G is an automorphism of $\mathcal{P}$ in the form (4). So we conclude $f(a,s,p)=\varphi_2^{-1}\circ\varphi_1^{-1}\circ G(a,s,p)$ is an automorphism of $\mathcal{P}$ in the form (4) also. The proof of Theorem 4 is complete.

Acknowledgments. The authors are grateful to Professors Ngaiming Mok and Xiaojun Huang for helpful comments. In addition, the authors would like to thank the referees for many helpful suggestions. The project was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No.11271291).

References

[1] J. Agler, Z.A. Lykova, N.J. Young, Extremal holomorphic maps and the symmetrized bidisc, Proc. London Math. Soc. 106(4)(2013) 781-818.

[2] J. Agler, Z. A. Lykova, N.J. Young, The complex geomety of a domain related to μ-synthesis, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 422(2015) 508-543.

[3] J. Agler, N. J. Young, The hyperbolic geometry of the symmetrized bidisc, J. Geom. Anal. 14 (2004) 375-403.

[4] S. Bell, Proper holomorphic mappings between circular domains, Comment. Math. Helvetici. 57(1982) 532-538.

[5] T. Bhattacharyya, S.Pal, S. Shyam Roy, Dilations of Γ-contractions by solving operator equations, Adv. Math. 230(2012) 577-606.

[6] C. Costara, The symmetrized bidisc and Lempert's theorem, Bull. London Math. Soc. 36 (2004) 656-662.

[7] G. Dini, A. S. Primicerio, Proper holomorphic mappings between generalized pseudoellipsoids, Annali di Matematica pura ed applicata(IV) CLVIII(1991) 219-229.

[8] J. C. Doyle, Analysis of feedback systems with structured uncertainties. IEE Proceedings 129(6)(1982) 242-250.

[9] A. Edigarian, A note on Costara's paper, Ann. Polon. Math. 83(2004) 189-191.

[10] A. Edigarian, L. Kosiński and W. Zwonek, The Lempert theorem and the tetrablock, J. Geom. Anal. 23(4)(2013) 1818-1831.

[11] A. Edigarian, W. Zwonek, Geometry of the symmetrized polydisc, Arch. Math. (Basel) 84(4)(2005) 364-374.

[12] X.J. Huang, On a linearity problem for proper holomorphic maps between balls in complex spaces of different dimansions, J. Diff. Geom. 51(1999) 13-33.

[13] L. Kosiński, Geometry of quasi-circular domains and application to tetrablock, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 139(2011) 559-569.

[14] L. Kosiński, The group of automorphisms of the pentablock, arXiv:1403.5214v3, to appear in Complex Anal. Oper. Theory.

[15] N. Mok, S.C. Ng, Z.H. Tu, Factorization of proper holomorphic maps on irreducible bounded symmetric domains of rank ≥ 2, Sci. China Math. 53(3)(2010) 813-826.

[16] J. Sarkar, Operator theory on symmetrized bidisc, arXiv:1207.1862, to appear in Indiana Univ. Math. J.

[17] Z.H. Tu, Rigidity of proper holomorphic mappings between equidimensional bounded symmetric domains, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 130(2002) 1035-1042.

[18] Z.H. Tu, Rigidity of proper holomorphic mappings between nonequidimensional bounded symmetric domains, Math. Z. 240(2002) 13-35.

[19] Z.H. Tu, L. Wang, Rigidity of proper holomorphic mappings between certain unbounded non-hyperbolic domains, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 419(2014) 703-714.

[20] N.J. Young, The automorphism group of the tetrablock, J. London Math. Soc. 77(3)(2008) 757-770.